UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,832	12/17/2003	Hee-Kwan Son	8947-000063/US	5440
	7590 12/02/200 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 8910)	NGO, CHUONG D		
RESTON, VA	20193		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/736,832	SON, HEE-KWAN	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Chuong D. Ngo	2193	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 October 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of <i>i</i> eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavial (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>5</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extractional extraction extractional extractional extractional extractional extractional extraction extraction extractional extraction	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	031160
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	timely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>8-41 and 51-55</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>1-7,42-50 and 56-</u>	<u>61</u> .		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatior REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>06/05/20</u>	008	
	/Chuong D Ngo/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2193	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection of claims 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding to withdrawn claims 1-7,42-50, and 56-61, it respectfully submitted that MPEP 821.02 does not require but only suggests that the claims to the non-elected invention should be treated by using form paragraph 8.05 in each subsequent action. Further, It was clearly stated in the Office action dated 10/15/2007 that the restriction requirement was made FINAL, and claims 1-7,42-50 and 56-61 were withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention. The final Office action date 06/11/2008 also repeated the withdrawal of 1-7,42-50 and 56-61 from consideration as clearly indicated in the Office Action Summary, and required applicant to cancel nonelected claims or to take appropriate action according to 37 CFR 1.44 and MPEP 821.01. Therefore, a complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Regarding to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101, it is respectfully submitted that the recitation "in a cryptosystem" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See In re Hirao, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Regarding to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), it is respectfully submitted that "a carry-save adder" referred in the rejection is the combination of the two 3 to-2 carry-save adders that form a 4 to 2 carry-save adder as in figure 5 of Wang et al and that correspond to the claimed "accumulator". It should be noted that figure 5 is illustrated in word level as figure 2 of the present invention. The figure if illustrated in bit level would shows a plurality of bit slices as that of figure 5 of the present invention, and each bit slice (a combination two 3 to 2 bits carry save adder forming a 4 to 2 carry save adder bit slice) would correspond to a claimed "compressor" that would clearly receive a multiple modulus (a multiple of N from MUXs), a partial product (a multiple of B from MUXs), a corresponding current sum and a corresponding current carry (the feedback from the carry save adder), and producing a corresponding next sum and a corresponding next carry (the output from the carry save adder) as claimed.